

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action mailed on April 1, 2009. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application with Claims 1, 7, 12 and 17 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 1, 7, 12 and 17 have been amended. No new matter or issues are believed to be introduced by the amendments.

Claims 1, 7, 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 7, 12 and 17 have been amended in a manner which is believed to overcome the rejection. Specifically, the language “based on user location” has been removed from each of the rejected claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7-9, 12, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Application No. 2003/0134650 to Sundar et al. in view of U.S. Application No. 2003/0065817 to Benchetritet, and further in view of U.S. Application No. 20040114553A1 to Jiang et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as presented herein, recites, *inter alia*, as follows:

“A communication method ... to bilaterally switch communication between the WWAN and a WLAN via a mobility supporting module suitable to use with a mobility control module ...

wherein the mobility supporting module may switch between the WWAN and WLAN **by providing updated WWAN and WLAN address information** via one or more encapsulating techniques.” (emphasis added.)

At the bottom of page 3 of the present Office Action, the Examiner admitted that Sundar does not disclose or suggest “establishing [a] mapping relationship between WWAN address and the WLAN address of the mobile terminal.” The Examiner relied on Benchetritet to cure such deficiencies.

However, according to the Office Action at page 4, Benchetritet “does not particularly refer to wherein the mobility support in [sic] module determines whether to switch between the WWAN and WLAN based on user location by providing updated WWAN and WLAN address information via one or more encapsulating techniques.” The Examiner relied on Jiang et al. to cure such deficiencies.

Jiang et al. is directed to interconnection and integration of a WWAN and a WLAN to provide continuous packet data services to mobile users where each mobile access terminal is configured to support both air links with the WWAN and WLAN. According to paragraph 0025 of Jiang et al., the “switching may be accomplished automatically **according to pre-set operating conditions in the control mechanism** as the AT [Access Terminal] moves from one location to another. For example, if the AT is initially connected to an AP [Access Point] but is moving out of the hot spot for that AP, the connection may then switch to the WWAN to continue the packet data service to the AT when the initial AP becomes unavailable.” (Emphasis added.)

Paragraph 0027 of Jiang et al. further states “A switching control mechanism may be implemented in ATs to control the interworking handoff between WWAN and WLAN, **e.g., based on signal strengths, user data rates, a suitable error rate, and other parameters.**” (Emphasis added)

Jiang et al. does not disclose or suggest Applicant’s claim language of the “mobility supporting module may switch between the WWAN and WLAN **by providing updated WWAN and WLAN address information** via one or more encapsulating techniques.” Specifically, Jiang et al. does not disclose or suggest switching between the WWAN and WLAN

by providing updated WWAN and WLAN address information via one or more encapsulating techniques as recited by Applicant's independent Claim 1.

As mentioned above, Jiang et al. teaches switching between the WWAN and WLAN according to pre-set operating conditions in the control mechanism, and based on signal strengths, user data rates, a suitable error rate, and other parameters—not be providing updated WWAN and WLAN address information via one or more encapsulating techniques as called for by Applicant's independent Claim 1.

Independent Claims 7, 12 and 17 include similar limitations to those of Claim 1, and are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons presented above for the patentability of independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 8, 9 and 18, are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons presented above for the patentability of independent Claims 1, 7, 12, and 17. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to Claims 1, 7, 8, 9, 12, 17 and 18 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 10, 11, 13-16, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundar et al. in view of Benchetritet, in view of Jiang et al., and further in view of U.S. Application No. 2005/0053034 to Chiueh. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 2-6, 10, 11, 13-16, 19 and 20, are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons presented above for the patentability of independent Claims 1, 7, 12 and 17. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to dependent Claims 2-6, 10, 11, 13-16, 19 and 20 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-20, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.  
Registration No. 43,600

Date: June 1, 2009

By:



George Likourezos  
Reg. No. 40,067  
Attorney for Applicant  
631-501-5706

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
**Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.**  
**Senior IP Counsel**  
**Philips Electronics North America Corp.**  
**P.O. Box 3001**  
**Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001**  
**Phone: (914) 333-9618**